

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 SCOTT PARIS,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 STEINBERG & STEINBERG, et. al.,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C11-993 MJP

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

15
16 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's third application for pro hac vice. (Dkt.
17 No. 52.) The application was filed on behalf of Noah D. Radbil, an attorney with the Houston,
18 TX office of Weisberg & Meyers, LLC. (Id.). For the reasons set forth below, the Court
19 DENIES the application and ORDERS Plaintiff to SHOW CAUSE as to why the Court should
20 not impose Rule 11 sanctions.

21 Plaintiff is filing a third application for pro hac vice because Plaintiff's previous two
22 applications did not comply with Local Rules and/or contained misinformation. Plaintiff's first
23 application for pro hac vice was signed by Jon N. Robbins as local counsel. (Dkt. No. 16.)
24 However, under General Rule 2(d) of the Local Rules, Mr. Robbins is not eligible to sponsor a

1 pro hac vice applicant because he does not maintain an office for the practice of law in the
2 Western District of Washington. The second application on behalf of Noah D. Radbil was
3 signed by Joshua Trigsted as local counsel. (Dkt. No. 17.) However, Mr. Trigsted's application
4 likewise failed for not maintaining an office in the Western District of Washington. Even though
5 Mr. Trigsted presented an address appearing to be in Seattle in the pro hac vice application, the
6 Court observed the address was impossible to place on a map. When the Court issued an order
7 to show cause and gave Plaintiff thirty days to properly file the application for pro hac vice, Mr.
8 Trigsted withdrew his representation.

9 Now, in response to the Court's order to show cause, Plaintiff files a third application for
10 pro hac vice on behalf of Noah D. Radbil. The Court finds Plaintiff's third application again
11 fails for misrepresenting information to the Court. While Mr. Robbins was the one who filed the
12 application through the court's electronic filing system, the application is signed by Matthew
13 Cunanan as local counsel. (Dkt. No. 52.) In reviewing the application, Mr. Cunanan does not
14 provide his correct bar number. Instead, Mr. Cunanan provides Mr. Trigsted's bar number. In
15 addition, the address provided by Mr. Cunanan (812 5th Avenue North #205, Seattle WA 98109)
16 is inconsistent with the address on file with this district's electronic docketing system (1900 S.
17 Puget Drive, Ste 203, Renton WA 98055). Considering this is the third time Plaintiff has failed
18 to properly file an application for pro hac vice, the Court will not take this misinformation
19 lightly.

20 \\
21 \\
22 \\
23 \\
24

1 The Court ORDERS Plaintiff to SHOW CAUSE why Jon Robbins and Matthew
2 Cunanan should not be sanctioned for, respectively, filing and signing a third pro hac vice
3 application with the incorrect bar number in violation of Rule 11(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil
4 Procedure. Plaintiff's response must be filed within seven (7) days of entry of this Order. In
5 addition, the Court will no longer wait for Plaintiff to properly seek local counsel. All pending
6 motions will now be considered.

7 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

8 Dated this 6th day of October, 2011.

9
10
11 

12 Marsha J. Pechman
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24